

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 were examined and rejected in this case. Claims 10-19 are being added. Claims 6 and 7 are being deleted. Claims 1-5 and 8-19 are currently pending.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner objected to the figures for failing to show a “preview button.” Applicant notes that element 312 in FIG. 3 is a “preview button.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 3, the Examiner objected to the Specification because element 1404 is not shown in FIG. 14(a). Applicant has amended the Specification to clarify that element 1404 is found in FIG. 14(c).

In paragraph 4, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 USC § 112 as reciting a step not disclosed in the Specification. Applicant directs the Examiner’s attention to the section entitled “User-Defined Locked Text Size” beginning on page 16, line 23/24 (section title takes up two lines), to page 17, line 18/19 (section title takes up two lines). In the section, Applicant discusses locking the size of text by the user. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 5, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9 under 35 USC § 112 as indefinite. More particularly, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6 for reciting “a primary split direction.” Applicant is amending the claim 2 to recite “the primary split direction,” and is canceling claim 6. The Examiner rejected claims 4, 8 and 9 for reciting “step if performed when.” As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant is amending claims 8 and 9 to replace “if” with “is.” Applicant is amending claim 4 to remove the rejected language. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection to claims 2, 4, 8 and 9 be withdrawn.

In paragraph 6, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 USC § 103 as unpatentable over Yamashita, in view of Quattro®, and further in view of Lemay. Yamashita discusses obtaining layout information of a scanned document. Quattro® discusses setting print orientation and print size. Lemay discusses some aspects of web publishing, but does not discuss primary split directions. None of the references discuss

or suggest “determining a primary split direction for the web page; and determining [needed] splits in the primary split direction for the web page,” as recited in claim 1, as amended, and as similarly recited in remaining independent claims 10, 11 and 12. Similarly, since dependent claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 13-19 depend from these independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that they are patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant therefore requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant requests the Examiner to enter the above amendments to the Specification. No new matter is being added.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3392.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 05-0150.

Respectfully Submitted,
Boye et al.

Dated: 8-3-99

Graham & James LLP
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
650-856-6500



Marc A. Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823